APPENDIX A

BASF'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' REMAINING OBJECTIONS February 21, 2018

No.	TESTIMONY	PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED OBJECTION	BASF's Response
1.	Q: And what was the nature of that communication? MR. COREN: To the extent that it was a counsel meeting, I'm going to instruct her not to answer on the basis of attorney-client privilege. Q: Did you speak to Mr. Bevan on Tuesday about the Williams case or something else? A· I couldn't speak to what we spoke of because it's under attorney-client privilege. Q: Did you discuss with Mr. Bevan your deposition today? A: Again, anything we discussed would be attorney-client privilege. Q: So you can't tell me whether you discussed preparation for your deposition with Mr. Bevan? MR. COREN: She's just asserted her attorney-client privilege, Peter. I don't understand the difference between the first and second question.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Plaintiffs have waived their privilege over conversations with Mr. Bevan.
5.	Q: At that meeting with Mr. Bevan and Mr. Coren, was that when you first learned about the allegations that are in the Williams complaint? MR. COREN: Objection. Privilege. A: That would be privileged information. I'm choosing not to answer.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Plaintiffs have waived their privilege over conversations with Mr. Bevan.

9.	Q: Do you know of any [of your attorneys] who has [researched other cases or complaints that have been filed against BASF or Engelhard in the past]? MR. COREN: Objection. Now you're getting back once again, it's work product. Now you're getting into attorney-client communication. So I'm instructing her not to answer.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Plaintiffs have waived their privilege over conversations with Mr. Bevan.
22.	Q: Did the Cohen Placitella firm ask you for a copy of the Bevan firm's opposition to BASF's Motion for Summary Judgment? MR. COREN: Objection. Don't answer. Privilege.	Attorney-Client Privilege	Plaintiffs have waived their privilege over conversations with the Bevan Firm. Moreover, the status of documents in plaintiffs' possession is not privileged.